

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are clarified by this amendment, support for which is found in the original claims and in Figs. 4-5. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 2003/0069881 (Huttunen); and Claims 2-3 and 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huttunen in view of U.S. 6,486,890 (Harada).

Claim 1, as clarified by the amendment submitted herewith, recites:

An information processing device, comprising:
storage means for storing content data of predetermined content; and
display control means for controlling display of the predetermined content on a display screen based on the stored content data, wherein:
the predetermined content is divided into a plurality of blocks to be consecutively displayed on the display screen, and ***the content data includes positional data which relates to the blocks and which is for setting a position on the display screen of a subsequent block to be displayed on the display screen relative to a position of a previous block on the display screen***, the subsequent block and the previous block identifying different blocks of the predetermined content; and
said display control means controls the display of the predetermined content by, based on the positional data, sequentially controlling display of one predetermined block in a predetermined position in units of the blocks, ***said positional data including data that describes the position of the subsequent block on the display screen in terms relative to the position of the previous block on the display screen.***

As clarified by the amendment submitted herewith, Claim 1 recites that the content data includes positional data which is for setting a position on a display screen of a subsequent block relative to a position of a previous block on the display screen. Further, the positional data includes data that describes the position of the subsequent block on the display screen in terms relative to the position of the previous block on the display screen. For the

reasons described below, it is respectfully submitted that neither Huttunen nor Harada describe these above-noted features, and consequently, the outstanding rejections should be withdrawn.

The Office Action relies on Huttunen to describe a partitioning agent which sets a maximum size of a fragment of a document, based on a memory buffer restriction of a device for displaying the fragment.¹ Further, the Office Action asserts that Huttunen discloses a link 352 to a previous fragment and adding the link 352 to a current fragment 222.² Therefore, the link 352 merely “references the previous sibling element node in the document order.”³ Huttunen is silent regarding describing positional data including data that describes a position on a display screen of a subsequent block to be displayed relative to a position on the display screen of a previous block, as recited in clarified Claim 1.

Harada does not remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Huttunen. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 (and any claim depending therefrom) is allowable over the cited references.

Furthermore, although directed at different statutory classes and/or varying in scope, Claims 4, 5 and 7 are also clarified by the amendment submitted herewith to recite features substantially similar to those noted above in clarified Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 4, 5 and 7 (and any claims depending therefrom) are allowable over the cited references.

¹ Office Action at page 4, citing Huttunen at paragraph [0060].

² Office Action at page 4, citing Huttunen at paragraph [0115].

³ Huttunen, paragraph [0115].

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Edward W. Tracy, Jr.
Registration No. 47,998